

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Paragraphs 28 and 42 of the Specification have been amended.

**Drawings.** The Examiner objected to the drawings because “they fail to show the power board/power device 25 (page 7 paragraph 42)” (10-5-05 Office Action, p.2). In fact, Figs. 1-5 correctly identify power supply 24, which is also referred to in paragraphs 24, 40 and 52 of the Specification. However, as the Examiner pointed out, the specification also refers to “power supply 25” (paragraph 28) and “power board 25” (paragraph 42), which should in fact refer to power supply 24. The typographical errors in paragraphs 28 and 42 are corrected by this Amendment.

**Section 112 Claim Rejections.** First, the Examiner pointed out the words “of the electric”, which are found in Claim 1 (stating that “the pump is powered by the DC voltage output from the power converter of the electric”). The words “of the electric” have been deleted from the claim to eliminate a typographical error and avoid any ambiguity. Second, the Examiner questioned the phrase “bypassing the sensor” in Claim 4. That phrase is unambiguous because Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, which does not recite the second liquid sensor of Claim 2. Claim 1 recites “a liquid sensor” which is essentially a first liquid sensor.

**Section 103 Claim Rejections.** Claims 1-18 were rejected as obvious over Izaguirre (US 5305779) in view of Leighton et al. (US 6676382). The Examiner admits that Izaguirre fails to teach the claimed AC to DC power conversion. The Examiner relies on Leighton for this teaching and yet Leighton merely uses AC power or battery power to energize the pump. The pump in Leighton is always connected to an AC power source (typically 110 Volts) which can be dangerous if the pump is in water. Leighton does not have a separate power converter unit that is non-integral with the pump. In contrast, the pump of the claimed invention is powered from DC voltage after it has been converted by a power converter that is separated from the pump.

Furthermore, even if the claimed features were shown in the combination of references, the Examiner has not pointed to a suggestion to combine the features of these references. In fact, neither Izaguirre nor Leighton are directed to the problem

solved by the claimed invention, namely, providing a simple, safe and portable leak detection and removal system. Izaguirre concerns an environmental protection or containment system for “operating large power generating stations” (title) such as is used “in a hydroelectric power station located within an hydroelectric dam” (Col. 6, lines 22-30). Similarly, Leighton must collect a substantial enough quantity of fluid in an enclosed chamber below ground level to mechanically move a float switch which is located above the pump. In contrast, the claimed invention uses a liquid sensor that completes an electrical circuit to send an electrical signal or activate a relay (which by definition means that the sensor is nonmechanical) to pump fluid or activate a notification system. No reference alone or in combination with other combinable references teaches the claimed invention of Claims 1-18.

Claims 1-18 are considered allowable for the reasons advanced above, and for the additional reason that the added subject matter thereof is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, applicant would like to request an interview with the Examiner at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Carl M. Ross  
158-160 Dogwood Ave  
Roslyn Harbor, N.Y. 11576  
Tel. No. (631) 231 4070